



Federal Acquisition Service

U.S. General Services Administration

Human Dimensions Support Services (HDSS) Evaluation Overview

Presented by:

Beth Clark
GSA SCO, HDSS 2018

Date

June 21, 2018

Location

SpringHill Suites by Marriott Huntsville Downtown
745 Constellation Dr,
Huntsville, AL 35801

Disclaimer

The content presented during Industry Day provides potential offerors an overview of likely/proposed parts of the solicitation for Human Dimension Support Services (HDSS) 2018. The Government may elect to incorporate all, some, or none of the sections and parts into the solicitation. The written terms and conditions of the final solicitation will govern over any information presented today.

Agenda

- Definition of Best Value
- Award Decision Criteria
- HDSS Overview
- HDSS Evaluation Process – Factors
- HDSS Evaluation Process
- Rating Scheme – Non-Price Factors
- Additional Rating Scheme – Past Performance

Definition of Best Value

FAR 2.101 - “Best value” means the expected outcome of an acquisition that, in the Government’s estimation, provides the greatest overall benefit in response to the requirement.

Award Decision Criteria

The Government will make an award to the offeror who is determined to be the best value to the Government. The best value to the Government will be determined by comparing the differences in the value of the non-price features with the differences in cost.

In making this comparison, the Government is more concerned with obtaining superior non-price features than with making an award at the lowest overall price to the Government.

However, the Government ***will not*** make an award at a significantly higher overall price to achieve a *slight* increase in performance.

HDSS Overview

➤ General Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) Structure

X001 Support Services

X002 Training Support Services

X003 Other Direct Costs (ODCs)

X004 Other Direct Costs (ODCs) - Travel

X005 Other Direct Costs (ODCs) - Training

X006 OASIS Contract Access Fee (CAF)

HDSS Overview

- All work will occur on Technical Work Directives (TWD)
- Performance-based, Firm Fixed Price (FFP) & Labor Hour (LH) with Reimbursable Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs) for Travel, Training, and Other Direct Costs (ODCs)
- Period of Performance
 - Base annual period plus four (4) annual options

Non-Price Factors Evaluation

The Government's evaluation will consist of four (4) separate and distinct non-price factors:

- Technical Capability
- Management Approach
- Staffing Plan
- Past Performance

General Evaluation Process - Factors



Non-Price Factors, when combined, are significantly more importance than cost/price

Transition Plan

- Offerors are on notice that ongoing services under this task order are vital to the Government and must be continued without interruption.
- The Offeror shall prepare, as part of their response to the solicitation, a Transition Plan describing their approach as to how they will assume the task order duties within the transition period.
- The contractor shall implement their Transition Plan presented in their quote immediately on award.
- The Transition Plan will not be a consideration in the evaluation process

Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI)

- This task order effort has potential for an OCI as identified in FAR 9.5 and DFARS 209.5.
- If the Contractor determines their company, including Subcontractors and Consultants, has an actual or potential OCI, the Contractor shall notify the CO, in writing. Any offeror written submissions regarding an actual or potential OCI shall be submitted as part of the quote. The written submissions shall include a proposed mitigation plan for review and ultimately incorporation into the task order. If the Government determines an OCI cannot be avoided, neutralized, or mitigated, the Offeror may be excluded from consideration for award.

Subcontracting Support Documentation

- The Offeror shall identify any portions of the task that will be performed by subcontractors. This information shall include the subcontracting firm and the specific duties and labor categories that will be performed by the subcontractor. The Offeror shall also furnish a written copy of the subcontracting agreement signed by all firms. This is for information purposes only and will not be evaluated.

Rating Scheme – Non-Price Factors

High Confidence (HC)

- Evaluation of the factor leaves virtually no doubt that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Little or no Government oversight is expected to be required in achieving the required level of performance.

Significant Confidence (SC)

- Evaluation of the factor leaves little doubt that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Minimal Government oversight is expected to be required in achieving the proposed level of performance.

Medium Confidence (MC)

- Evaluation of the factor leaves some doubt that the Offeror can successfully perform the required effort, however it is believed that there is a high probability that the Offeror can perform successfully. Some Government oversight is expected to be required to meet the contract requirements.

Low Confidence (LC)

- Evaluation of the factor leaves substantial doubt that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Substantial Government oversight or intervention is expected to be required in achieving the proposed level of performance. Changes in the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary to achieve contract requirements.

No Confidence (NC)

- Evaluation of the factor leaves extreme doubt that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort, regardless of the degree of Government oversight.

Rating Scheme – Past Performance

High Confidence (HC)

- Based on the recency, relevance and how well the Offeror performed, evaluation of the factor leaves virtually no doubt that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Little or no Government oversight is expected to be required in achieving the required level of performance.

Significant Confidence (SC)

- Based on the recency, relevance and how well the Offeror performed, evaluation of the factor leaves little doubt that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Minimal Government oversight is expected to be required in achieving the proposed level of performance.

Medium Confidence (MC)

- Based on the recency, relevance and how well the Offeror performed, the evaluation of the factor leaves some doubt that the Offeror can successfully perform the required effort, however it is believed that there is a high probability that the Offeror can perform successfully. Some Government oversight is expected to be required to meet the contract requirements.

Little Confidence (LC)

- Based on the recency, relevance and how well the Offeror performed, the evaluation of the factor leaves substantial doubt that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Substantial Government oversight or intervention is expected to be required in achieving the proposed level of performance. Changes in the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary to achieve contract requirements.

No Confidence (NC)

- Based on the recency, relevance and how well the Offeror performed, the evaluation of the factor leaves extreme doubt that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort, regardless of the degree of Government oversight

Unknown Confidence (Neutral)

- In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance.

Rating Scheme – Past Performance, *Relevancy*

Very Relevant (VR)

- Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Relevant (R)

- Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Somewhat Relevant (SR)

- Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Not Relevant (NR)

- Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

HDSS Evaluation Summary

- Evaluation Factor : Technical Capability (Evaluated)
- Evaluation Factor : Management Approach (Evaluated)
- Evaluation Factor : Staffing Plan (Evaluated)
- Evaluation Factor : Past Performance (Evaluated)
- Price QUOTE (Evaluated)
- VOLUME: Transition Plan (Not Evaluated)
- VOLUME: Subcontracting Support Documentation, if applicable (Not Evaluated)

Questions

*Please submit all questions and comments via Google
form link*



Thank you!